

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/521,943	SUEHIRO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David J. Makiya	2885	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) David J. Makiya.

(2) Scott Tulino (Reg. No. 48,317).

**Date of Interview:** 8 June 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*1-3, 5, 10, 11, 14, and 29*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner suggested an amendment that incorporated the power supply member and the planar member both comprising reflective surfaces. The applicant's attorney agreed with the proposed language detailed in the Examiner's Amendment/Comment. Claim 2 and its dependent claims 3, 5, 10, and 11 are canceled because claim 2 is identical to claim 1..